

First-principles study of the electrooptic effect in ferroelectric oxides

Marek Veithen,¹ Xavier Gonze,² and Philippe Ghosez¹

¹*Département de Physique, Université de Liège, B-5, B-4000 Sart-Tilman, Belgium*

²*Unité PCPM, UCL, place Croix du Sud, 1, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

We first present a method to compute the electrooptic tensor from first principles, explicitly taking into account the electronic, ionic and piezoelectric contributions. We then study the non-linear optic behavior of three paradigmatic ferroelectric oxides. Our calculations reveal the dominant contribution of the soft mode to the electrooptic coefficients in LiNbO₃ and BaTiO₃ and its minor role in PbTiO₃. We identify the coupling between the electric field and the polar atomic displacements along the B-O chains as the origin of the large electrooptic response in perovskite ABO₃ compounds.

PACS numbers: 77.84.-s, 78.20.Jq, 71.15.Mb

The electrooptic (EO) effect describes the change of refractive index of a material in a static electric field and is exploited in various technological applications [1]. Ferroelectric ABO₃ compounds exhibit unusually large EO coefficients and are therefore materials of choice for optical devices. Since the seventies, LiNbO₃ EO modulators have been widely used in fiber-optic transmission systems [2]. More recently, there has been increasing interest in epitaxially grown BaTiO₃ thin films for optical waveguide modulators [3]. The EO effect is the origin of the photorefractive effect, exploited in non-volatile holographic data storage in LiNbO₃ [4]. It was also used to probe locally the ferroelectricity in SrTiO₃ films [5].

Finding better EO materials is a desirable goal. However, the experimental characterization of optical nonlinearities requires high-quality single crystals that are not always directly accessible nor easy to make. Input from accurate theoretical calculations allowing to *predict* the non-linear optical behavior of crystalline solids would therefore be particularly useful.

For many years, theoretical investigations of non-linear optical phenomena were restricted to semi-empirical approaches such as shell models [6] or bond-charge models [7, 8]. In the last decade, significant theoretical advances have been reported concerning first-principles density functional theory (DFT) calculations of the behavior of periodic systems in an external electric field [9, 10] and opened the way to direct predictions of various optical phenomena. Recently, particular attention has been paid to the calculation of non-linear optical (NLO) susceptibilities and Raman cross sections [11, 12].

In this Letter, we go one step further and present a method to predict the *linear EO coefficients* of periodic solids within DFT. Our method is very general, and can be applied to paradigmatic ferroelectric oxides: LiNbO₃, BaTiO₃ and PbTiO₃. We find that first-principles calculations are fully predictive, and provide significant new insights into the microscopic origin of the EO effect. In particular, we highlight the *predominant role of the soft mode* in the EO coupling of LiNbO₃ and BaTiO₃, in contrast with its *minor role* in PbTiO₃.

At linear order, the dependence of the optical dielectric tensor ε_{ij} on the static (or low-frequency) electric field

$\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ is described by the linear EO tensor $r_{ij\gamma}$:

$$\Delta(\varepsilon^{-1})_{ij} = \sum_{\gamma=1}^3 r_{ij\gamma} \mathcal{E}_\gamma. \quad (1)$$

Throughout this paper, we follow the convention of using Greek and Roman indexes (resp.) to label static and optical fields (resp.). We write all vector and tensor components in the system of cartesian coordinates defined by the principal axes of the crystal under zero field. We also refer to the atomic displacements $\tau_{\kappa\alpha}$ [κ labels an atom and α a cartesian direction] within the basis defined by the zone-center transverse optic (TO) phonon eigendisplacements $u_m(\kappa\alpha)$: $\tau_{\kappa\alpha} = \sum_m \tau_m u_m(\kappa\alpha)$.

Let us first consider the *clamped* (zero strain) EO tensor, $r_{ij\gamma}^\eta$, in which all electric-field induced macroscopic strains η are forbidden. This is achieved experimentally by working at a frequency sufficiently high to avoid strain relaxations but low compared to the frequency of the TO modes. Within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, we express the *total* derivative of ε_{ij} as the sum of two *partial* derivatives with respect to $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ and τ_m :

$$\frac{d\varepsilon_{ij}}{d\mathcal{E}_\gamma} = \left. \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{ij}}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\gamma} \right|_{\tau=0} + 4\pi \sum_m \left. \frac{\partial \chi_{ij}^{(1)}}{\partial \tau_m} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} \frac{\partial \tau_m}{\partial \mathcal{E}_\gamma}. \quad (2)$$

The derivative in the first term of the righthand side of Eq. (2) is computed at clamped atomic positions. It describes the *electronic* contribution to the EO tensor and is proportional to the NLO susceptibilities $\chi_{ijl}^{(2)}$. The second term represents the *ionic* contribution. It depends on the first-order change of the linear dielectric susceptibility due to atomic displacements, and is related to the Raman susceptibility $\alpha_{ij}^m = \sqrt{\Omega} \sum_{\kappa\alpha} \frac{\partial \chi_{ij}^{(1)}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa\alpha}} u_m(\kappa\alpha)$ of mode m [Ω is the unit cell volume], as well as to the amplitude of the ionic relaxation induced by the field $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$. $\partial \tau_m / \partial \mathcal{E}_\gamma$ can be expressed in terms of (i) the TO phonon mode frequencies ω_m and (ii) the TO mode polarities $p_{m,\gamma} = \sum_{\kappa,\beta} Z_{\kappa,\gamma\beta}^* u_m(\kappa\beta)$, directly linked to the infrared (IR) intensities [13]. Combining this with the previous equations, we obtain the clamped EO tensor [14]

$$r_{ij\gamma}^\eta = \frac{-8\pi}{n_i^2 n_j^2} \chi_{ijl}^{(2)} \bigg|_{l=\gamma} - \frac{4\pi}{n_i^2 n_j^2 \sqrt{\Omega}} \sum_m \frac{\alpha_{ij}^m p_{m,\gamma}}{\omega_m^2} \quad (3)$$

where n_i and n_j are the principal refractive indices.

Let us now consider the *unclamped* (zero stress) EO tensor, $r_{ij\gamma}^\sigma$. It can be shown [14] that the macroscopic expression proposed in Ref. [15] is still valid at the microscopic level so that the piezoelectric contribution to $r_{ij\gamma}^\sigma$ can be computed from the elasto-optic coefficients $p_{ij\alpha\beta}$ and the piezoelectric strain coefficients $d_{\gamma\alpha\beta}$

$$r_{ij\gamma}^\sigma = r_{ij\gamma}^\eta + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^3 p_{ij\alpha\beta} d_{\gamma\alpha\beta}. \quad (4)$$

An expression similar to Eq. (3) was previously used by Johnston [16] to estimate the clamped EO tensor of LiNbO₃ and LiTaO₃ from IR and Raman measurements. However, this semi-empirical approach was limited by the indeterminacy of the relative sign of $\mathbf{p}_m$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^m$. As discussed below, the direct evaluation of Eq. (3) and (4) from first principles provides an *easier* and *more accurate* estimate of the EO tensor.

We have implemented this formalism in the ABINIT open software [17], within the local density approximation (LDA) to the DFT. The optical dielectric tensor, Born effective charges, phonon frequencies and eigendisplacements are computed from linear response [13]. The piezoelectric strain coefficients $d_{\gamma\alpha\beta}$ are deduced from the piezoelectric stress coefficients $e_{\gamma\alpha\beta}$ and the elastic constants. These two quantities, as well as the elasto-optic tensor $p_{ij\alpha\beta}$, are obtained from finite differences. The non-linear response functions $\chi_{ijl}^{(2)}$ and $\partial\chi_{ij}^{(1)}/\partial\tau_{\kappa\alpha}$ are computed from a perturbative approach using a new implementation based on the $2n+1$ theorem. To reach reasonable k-point sampling convergence, we combined the recently proposed PEAD expression [9] and the finite difference formula of Marzari and Vanderbilt [18] to compute the perturbation expansion of the polarization. More details will be provided elsewhere [14]. The method was tested on various cubic semiconductors and provides results in close agreement with earlier studies [10, 11].

For BaTiO₃ and PbTiO₃, we use extended norm-conserving pseudopotentials [19], a planewave kinetic energy cutoff of 45 hartree and a $10 \times 10 \times 10$ k-point grid. For LiNbO₃, we use the same norm-conserving pseudopotentials as in Ref. [20] as well as the Born effective charges, phonon frequencies and eigenvectors already reported in that paper. For this compound, a $8 \times 8 \times 8$ k-point grid and a planewave kinetic energy cutoff of 35 hartree give converged values for $\chi_{ijl}^{(2)}$ and $\partial\chi_{ij}^{(1)}/\partial\tau_{\kappa\alpha}$.

First, we study LiNbO₃. This compound has a trigonal symmetry with 10 atoms per unit cell. The theoretical lattice constants and atomic positions are reported in Ref. [20]. LiNbO₃ undergoes a single transition at 1480 K from a centrosymmetric high-T paraelectric $R\bar{3}c$ phase

to a ferroelectric low-T R3c ground state. The form of the EO tensor depends on the choice of the cartesian axes. Here, we follow the I.R.E. Piezoelectric Standards [21].

With this choice of axes, the EO tensor in the ferroelectric phase of LiNbO₃ has 4 independent elements (Voigt notations): r_{13} , r_{33} , r_{22} and r_{51} . The TO modes can be classified into $4A_1 + 5A_2 + 9E$. The A_1 and E modes are Raman and IR active. Only the A_1 modes couple to r_{13} and r_{33} , while the E modes are linked to r_{22} and r_{51} . Table I gives these four clamped coefficients [22], as well as the contribution of each optical phonon. For comparison, we mention the coefficients computed by Johnston [16] from measurements of IR and Raman intensities (IR + R) as well as the results of a bond-charge model (BCM) calculation by Shih and Yariv [8]. The first-principles calculations correctly predict the sign of the four EO coefficients [21]. The absolute values are also well reproduced by our method, especially if we take into account the fact that NLO properties are generally difficult to determine accurately. The experimental values are sensitive to external parameters such as temperature changes [23] and the stoichiometry of the samples. For example, using crystals of various compositions, Abdi and co-workers measured absolute values between 1.5 pm/V and 9.9 pm/V for r_{22}^σ [24]. These difficulties support the need for sophisticated theoretical tools to predict NLO properties. In contrast to the models of Refs. [8, 16], our method is predictive and does not use any experimental parameters. Moreover, it reproduces r_{13}^η , r_{33}^η and r_{22}^η better than the semiempirical models.

Our approach also provides some insight into the origin of the high LiNbO₃ EO response. All EO coefficients are dominated by the ionic contribution of the A_1 TO1 and the E TO1 modes. This can be explained as follows. At the paraelectric-ferroelectric phase transition, the unstable A_{2u} and E_u modes of the paraelectric phase transform to *low-frequency* and *highly polar* modes in the ferroelectric phase [20], generating a large EO response if they exhibit, in addition, a *large Raman susceptibility*. The A_1 TO1 and E TO1 modes of the ferroelectric phase have a strong overlap of respectively 0.82 and 0.68 with the unstable A_{2u} and E_u modes of the paraelectric phase and combine giant polarity [20] and large Raman susceptibility (see below for the A_1 mode).

In Table I, we also report the unclamped EO coefficients in LiNbO₃. As the piezoelectric coefficients d_{31} (-1 pC/N) and d_{33} (6 pC/N) are small compared to d_{15} (55.9 pC/N) and d_{22} (21.6 pC/N), the piezoelectric effect is important for r_{22}^σ and r_{51}^σ and negligible for r_{13}^σ and r_{33}^σ . The unclamped EO coefficient r_{51}^σ is nearly twice as large as the clamped one. Moreover, its theoretical value is in better agreement with the experiment than that of the clamped one. This suggests that the piezoelectric contribution was not entirely eliminated during the measurement of r_{51}^η ; the correct value of the clamped coefficient might be closer to the theoretical 14.9 pm/V.

Second, we study PbTiO₃ and BaTiO₃. Both compounds are stable at room temperature in a ferroelec-

TABLE I: EO tensor (pm/V) in LiNbO_3 : electronic, ionic and piezoelectric contributions, and comparison with experiment, for the clamped and unclamped cases. The ionic part is split into contributions from TO modes (ω_m in cm^{-1}).

		A ₁ -modes			E-modes		
		ω_m	r_{13}	r_{33}	ω_m	r_{22}	r_{51}
Electronic			1.0	4.0		0.2	1.0
Ionic	TO1	243	6.2	18.5	155	3.0	7.5
	TO2	287	-0.2	-0.4	218	0.4	1.5
	TO3	355	-0.1	0.0	264	0.6	1.3
	TO4	617	2.8	4.8	330	-0.3	1.2
	TO5				372	-0.2	0.4
	TO6				384	-0.1	-0.2
	TO7				428	0.2	0.2
	TO8				585	0.7	2.1
	TO9				677	0.0	0.0
	Sum of ionic		8.7	22.9		4.4	13.9
Strain			0.8	0.1		3.0	13.7
Clamped	Present		9.7	26.9		4.6	14.9
	Exp. [25]		8.6	30.8		3.4	28
	IR+R [16]		12	39		6	19
	BCM [8]			25.9			20.5
Unclamped	Present		10.5	27.0		7.5	28.6
	Exp. [25]		10.0	32.2		6.8	32.6
	Exp. [24]					9.9	

tric distorted perovskite structure of tetragonal P4mm symmetry with 5 atoms per unit cell [26]. In the P4mm phase, the TO modes can be classified into $3A_1 + 4E + B_1$. The EO tensor has only three independent elements: r_{13} , and r_{33} , coupling to the A₁ modes, and r_{42} , linked to the E modes. The B₁-mode is IR inactive and does not influence the EO tensor. The results are shown in Table II.

For PbTiO_3 , we found only measurements of r_{13}^η and r_{33}^η , which agree well with our theoretical results. Moreover, our calculation predicts that PbTiO_3 exhibits a large r_{42}^η , in spite of its low r_{33}^η . Combined with other advantageous features, such as small thermo-optic coefficients [29], this suggests that PbTiO_3 *might be* an interesting candidate for EO applications *if properly oriented*.

In BaTiO_3 , the low temperature structure is rhombohedral. The P4mm phase is unstable and exhibits, in the harmonic approximation, an unstable E-mode that prevents the use of Eq. (3) to compute r_{42}^η . The theoretical estimates of r_{13}^η and r_{33}^η are reasonably accurate despite an underestimation of the theoretical r_{33}^η . The origin of the error can be attributed to various sources. First, the values computed for the P4mm phase correspond to an extrapolation of the EO tensor to 0 K, while experimental results are obtained at room temperature. Also, linear and NLO susceptibilities can be relatively inaccurate within the LDA. In this context, note the use of the LDA optical refractive indexes in Eq. (3), overestimating the experimental values by about 10 %.

We compare now the NLO response of the three compounds. r_{13}^η is similar for all of them, while r_{33}^η is significantly smaller in PbTiO_3 than in LiNbO_3 and BaTiO_3 .

TABLE II: Electronic and ionic contributions of individual TO modes (ω_m in cm^{-1}) to the clamped EO tensor (pm/V) in the P4mm phase of PbTiO_3 and BaTiO_3 .

		PbTiO_3			BaTiO_3		
		A ₁ -modes			E-modes		
		ω_m	r_{13}^η	r_{33}^η	ω_m	r_{42}^η	
Elec.			2.1	0.5		2.2	
TO1		151	3.9	2.9	79	16.4	161
TO2		357	1.4	0.7	202	10.5	300
TO3		653	1.6	1.8	269	0.2	505
TO4					484	1.2	
Tot			9.0	5.9		30.5	
Exp. [27]			13.8	5.9			
Exp. [15]							10.2
Exp. [28]							8

TABLE III: Raman susceptibilities and mode polarities (10^{-2} a. u.) of the A₁ TO modes in LiNbO_3 , BaTiO_3 and PbTiO_3 .

		LiNbO_3			BaTiO_3			PbTiO_3		
		p_3	α_{11}	α_{33}	p_3	α_{11}	α_{33}	p_3	α_{11}	α_{33}
TO1		3.65	-0.70	-2.02	1.22	-0.16	-0.13	1.25	-0.67	-0.43
TO2		0.45	0.30	0.53	3.25	-1.18	-2.73	2.18	-0.75	-0.33
TO3		0.67	0.18	-0.05	1.74	-1.26	-2.55	2.68	-2.42	-2.28
TO4		3.82	-1.96	-3.23						

In the latter two compounds, the magnitude of r_{33}^η is dominated by one particular phonon mode. In BaTiO_3 , the TO2 mode at 300 cm^{-1} has a similar strong overlap (92%) with the unstable mode in the paraelectric phase than the TO1 modes in LiNbO_3 , as previously discussed. In PbTiO_3 , all A₁ modes contribute almost equally to r_{33}^η . The TO2 mode at 357 cm^{-1} has the strongest overlap (73%) with the soft mode in the cubic phase. Surprisingly, its contribution to r_{33}^η is *23.5 times smaller* than the contribution of the TO2 mode in BaTiO_3 .

To identify the origin of the distinctive behavior of PbTiO_3 , we report in Table III the mode polarities and Raman susceptibilities of the A₁ TO modes. In the three compounds, α has two independent elements α_{11} and α_{33} that determine the amplitude of r_{13}^η and r_{33}^η . α_{33} is large for the TO1 mode in LiNbO_3 and the TO2 mode in BaTiO_3 . On the other hand, it is the smallest for the TO2 mode in PbTiO_3 , in agreement with experiments [30]. Combined with a higher frequency ($\omega_{\text{PbTiO}_3}^2/\omega_{\text{BaTiO}_3}^2 = 1.41$), a lower polarity ($p_{\text{BaTiO}_3}/p_{\text{PbTiO}_3} = 1.49$), and a larger value of the refractive index ($n_{\text{PbTiO}_3}^4/n_{\text{BaTiO}_3}^4 = 1.35$), this weak Raman susceptibility ($\alpha_{\text{BaTiO}_3}/\alpha_{\text{PbTiO}_3} = 8.27$) explains the weak contribution of the TO2 mode to r_{33}^η in PbTiO_3 .

The microscopic origin of the lower A₁ TO2 mode Raman susceptibility in PbTiO_3 , compared to BaTiO_3 , is explained by the decomposition of α_{33} into contributions of the individual atoms in the unit cell (see Table IV). In both perovskites, the major contributions to the Raman susceptibility of the A₁ TO2 modes are $\alpha_{33}(Ti)$ and

TABLE IV: Decomposition of the Raman susceptibility of the A_1 TO2 mode in $BaTiO_3$ and $PbTiO_3$ into contributions from the individual atoms in the unit cell [26].

κ	$BaTiO_3$			$PbTiO_3$		
	$\sqrt{\Omega} \frac{\partial \chi_{33}^{(1)}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa 3}}$ (a.u.)	$u(\kappa, 3)$ (10^{-2} a.u.)	$\alpha_{33}(\kappa)$	$\sqrt{\Omega} \frac{\partial \chi_{33}^{(1)}}{\partial \tau_{\kappa 3}}$ (a.u.)	$u(\kappa, 3)$ (10^{-2} a.u.)	$\alpha_{33}(\kappa)$
Ba/Pb	0.45	-0.014	-0.01	-1.00	-0.006	0.01
Ti	-6.46	0.257	-1.66	-2.64	0.216	-0.57
O ₁	5.15	-0.167	-0.86	3.69	0.059	0.22
O ₂ /O ₃	0.43	-0.240	-0.10	-0.02	-0.316	0.01
Tot			-2.73			-0.32

$\alpha_{33}(O_1)$ [26]; α_{33} is mostly due to the atomic displacements of the atoms located on the Ti–O chains oriented along the polar direction. First, the derivatives of $\chi_{33}^{(1)}$ versus atomic displacement are of opposite sign for Ti and O₁ atoms, and significantly larger in $BaTiO_3$ than in $PbTiO_3$. Second, the opposing displacements of Ti and O₁ atoms in the TO2 mode in $BaTiO_3$ produce contributions that add to yield a giant α_{33} . On the other hand, the in-phase displacements of Ti and O₁ in $PbTiO_3$ produce contributions that cancel out, giving a small α_{33} . This distinct behaviour goes beyond a simple mass effect.

Changing the mass of Pb to that of Ba in the dynamical matrix of $PbTiO_3$ has no significant effect on the relative Ti–O displacement. Large atomic displacements of opposite direction along the Ti–O chains are therefore needed to generate a large α_{33} and potentially a large r_{33} .

In summary, we presented a method to compute the EO tensor from first principles. In $LiNbO_3$ and $BaTiO_3$, the large EO response originates in the giant contribution of the successor of the soft mode, which combines low frequency, high polarity and high Raman susceptibility. In comparison, the contribution of the similar mode in tetragonal $PbTiO_3$ is rather weak due to its low Raman susceptibility. In the perovskites, the Raman susceptibility is principally determined by the atomic displacements along the B–O chains in the polar direction. This suggests that the search for new perovskite oxides with good EO properties should focus on compounds with large relative B–O atomic displacements along the chains.

We thank M. Fontana, P. Bourson and B. Champagne for discussions and K. M. Rabe for reading the manuscript. MV and XG acknowledge FNRS Belgium. The work was supported by the Volkswagen Stiftung (Nano-sized ferroelectric Hybrids, I/77 737), FNRS (9.4539.00 and 2.4562.03), the Région Wallonne (Nomade, 115012), the PAI 5.01 and EU Exciting network.

-
- [1] M. E. Lines and A. M. Glass, "Principles and applications of ferroelectrics and related materials", Clarendon Press, Oxford (1977).
 - [2] L. Wooten *et al.*, IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron. **6**, 69 (2000).
 - [3] A. Petraru, J. Schubert, M. Schmid and Ch. Buchal, Appl. Phys. Lett. **81**, 1375 (2002).
 - [4] K. Buse, A. Adibi and D. Psalti, Nature **393**, 665 (1998).
 - [5] O. Tikhomirov, H. Jiang and J. Levy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 147601 (2002).
 - [6] H. Chaib, A. Toumanari, D. Khatib and W. Kinase, Ferroelectrics **234**, 61 (1999).
 - [7] B. F. Levine, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 2600 (1973).
 - [8] C.-C. Shih and A. Yariv, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **15**, 825 (1982).
 - [9] R. W. Nunes and X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 155107 (2001).
 - [10] I. Souza, J. Íñiguez, and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 117602 (2002).
 - [11] A. Dal Corso, F. Mauri and A. Rubio, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 15638 (1996); G. Deinzer and D. Strauch, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 100301 (2002).
 - [12] M. Lazzeri and F. Mauri, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 36401 (2003).
 - [13] X. Gonze and C. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 10355 (1997).
 - [14] M. Veithen, Ph. Ghosez and X. Gonze, unpublished.
 - [15] M. Zgonik *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 5941 (1994).
 - [16] W. D. Johnston Jr., Phys. Rev. B **1**, 3494 (1970).
 - [17] X. Gonze *et al.*, Computational Materials Science **25**, 478 (2002); [URL: www.abinit.org].
 - [18] N. Marzari and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 12847 (1997).
 - [19] M. P. Teter, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 5031 (1993).
 - [20] M. Veithen and Ph. Ghosez, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 214302 (2002).
 - [21] K. F. Hulme, P. H. Davies and V. M. Cound, J. Phys. C **2**, 855 (1969).
 - [22] It is usual to define an effective EO coefficient $r_c = r_{33} - (n_o/n_e)^3 r_{13}$ where n_o and n_e are the ordinary and extraordinary refractive indices. The theoretical values of (n_o, n_e, r_c^n) are: $LiNbO_3$ (2.37, 2.35, 17.0), $BaTiO_3$ (2.55, 2.42, 11.9), $PbTiO_3$ (2.70, 2.61, -4.1). The experimental values are: $LiNbO_3$ (2.28, 2.19, 21.2), $BaTiO_3$ (2.41, 2.36, 29.7), $PbTiO_3$ (2.67, 2.66, -8.0).
 - [23] M. Aillerie *et al.*, J. Appl. Phys. **65**, 2406 (1989).
 - [24] F. Abdi, M. Aillerie, P. Bourson, M. D. Fontana and K. Polgar, J. Appl. Phys. **84**, 2251 (1998).
 - [25] A. R  uber, Current Topics in Materials Science, vol. 1, ed. E. Kaldis (North-Holland, 1978), p. 481.
 - [26] Reduced coordinates of P4mm $BaTiO_3$ and $PbTiO_3$: Ba/Pb (0,0,0), Ti (0.5,0.5,0.5+ δ_{Ti}), O₁ (0.5,0.5,0+ δ_{O1}), O₂ (0.5,0,0.5+ δ_{O2}) and O₃ (0,0.5,0.5+ δ_{O2}). Relaxation at experimental lattice constants yields for $BaTiO_3$ ($PbTiO_3$): $\delta_{Ti} = 0.0136$ (−0.0478), $\delta_{O1} = -0.0273$ (−0.1205), $\delta_{O2} = -0.0167$ (−0.1278).
 - [27] *Handbook of Laser Science and Technology*, Optical Materials: Part 2 Vol. IV, ed. M. J. Weber (CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 1986).
 - [28] S. H. Wemple and D. DiDomenico Jr., in *Applied Solid State Science*, ed. R. Wolfe (Academic, N.Y., 1972).
 - [29] M. D. Fontana, F. Abdi and K. Wojcik, J. Appl. Phys. **77**, 2102 (1995).
 - [30] M. D. Fontana, H. Idrissi, G. E. Kugel and K. Wojcik, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **3**, 8695 (1991).